## STATE OF HAWAII NOTICE OF EXEMPTION FROM CHAPTER 103D, HRS

The Chief Procurement Officer is in the process of reviewing the request from the Department of	Public S	Safety
for exemption from Chapter 103D, HRS, for the following goods, servi		

Housing of female inmates in a secure confinement facility in another state, to include care and custody, health care and transportation.

Vendor: **GRW** Corporation

Address: 6104 Belle Rive Drive

> Brentwood, TN 37027

Term of Contract:	From: Date of	To: June 30, 2005   Cost:	
i I	Approval		\$1,604,145.00

Direct any inquiries to: Department:

Department of Public Safety

Frank Lopez, Deputy Director for Corrections

Contact Name/Title:

Address:

919 Ala Moana Boulevard

Room 400

Honolulu, HI 96814

Fax Number:

Date Posted: June 30, 2004

587-1282

Phone Number: 587-1340

A copy of this notice of exemption from Chapter 103D, HRS, shall be posted by the Chief Procurement Officer and the purchasing agency in an area accessible to the public, at least seven (7) calendar days prior to any approval action.

Submit written objections to this notice to issue an exemption from Chapter 103D, HRS, within seven (7) calendar days from

the date posted to: Chief Procurement Officer

Office/Agency State Procurement Office

Address 1151 Punchbowl Street

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

'04 JUN 30 P1:45

## STATE OF HAWAII REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM CHAPTER 103D, HRS

TO:	Chief Procurement Offic	er				STATE OF HAWAII	
FROM:	Department	of	Public	Safety,	Director's	Office	
	(Department/Division/Agency)						

Pursuant to \$ 103D-102(b)(4), HRS, and Chapter 3-120, HAR, the Department requests a procurement exemption to purchase the following:

Description of goods, services, or construction:

Housing of female inmates in a secure confinement facility in another state, to include care and custody, health care and transportation.

Name of Vendor: Address:	GRW Corporation 6104 Belle Rive I Brentwood, TN 37	Cost: \$1,604,145.00				
Term of Contract:	From: Date of Approval	To:	June	30,	2005	Prior Exemption Ref. No. (if applicable)

Explanation describing how procurement by competitive means is either not practicable or not advantageous to the State:

See Attached

Details of the process or procedure to be followed in selecting the vendor to ensure maximum fair and open competition as practicable:

See Attached

## REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM CHAPTER 103D, HRS (Cont.)

A descrip	tion of the agency's	s internal controls and approva	l requirements for the exemp	pted procurement:
See A	Attached			
		modition title who will be in-	-11 ' Al1	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
A list of a	gency personner, by	position title, who will be inv	olved in the approval proces	ss and administration of the contract
Deput	y Director	ic Safety, John Frank Lopez will 1 serve as contr	administer the	rove the Agreement. contract.
Direct que		r Erank Ionor		Phone Number:
рерт	ity Directo.	r Frank Lopez		587-1340
This exemp	otion should be consi	idered for list of exemptions a	tached to Chapter 3-120, HA	AR: Yes□ NoXIX
I CE	ERTIFY THAT THE	INFORMATION PROVIDE		EST OF MY KNOWLEDGE,
		TRUE ANI		esigned G/25/04/Date
٠			V Title (If other than Dep	partment Head)
Chief Proc	urement Officer's Co	omments:		
Please ensu	re adherence to applic	cable administrative requireme	ents.	
П	APPROVED	☐ DISAPPROVED		
<u> </u>			Chief Procurement Offic	cer Date
cc: Adr	ninistrator, e Procurement Office			

P.E. No 04-61-M

## ATTACHMENT FOR REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM CHAPTER 103D, H.R.S.

1. The Women's Community Correctional Center ("WCCC") is overcrowded. As of June 21, 2004, WCCC housed 293 female inmates in a facility with an operating capacity of 260. For various reasons, approximately 69 additional inmates are under the jurisdiction of WCCC, but not present at the facility. The reasons include alternative housing at T.J. Mahoney or furlough for women transitioning into the community, hospitalization, or intermittent sentencing by the court. Although not physically present at WCCC, these women remain under the jurisdiction of WCCC because PSD could change their status and require these women to return.

An additional 63 female inmates are currently housed in the Mabel Bassett Correctional Center in Oklahoma. The contract with the State of Oklahoma will expire on July 1, 2004, although we are seeking a thirty day extension with them in order to obtain this exemption. Because WCCC is already overcrowded, the 63 female inmates on the mainland cannot be returned to WCCC, the only female prison in the State of Hawaii.

The Department has been searching for bed space in other states that are suitable for housing these female inmates. When evaluating facilities, we have reviewed the following factors:

**ACA** Accreditation Medical Substance Abuse Treatment Program Cognitive Restructuring Program Living Skills Program Education **Vocational Training** Work lines Religious Program **Disciplinary Process** Grievance Process Commissary Case management **Staff Training** Cultural based programs Food Service Transportation Costs to move from Oklahoma Cost per inmate per day Government entity Reasonable request from PSD Experience of Staff Age of facility Size of facility Gender specific housing

The Department has located suitable bed space for these 63 female inmates in Brush County, Colorado. These beds were available as of July 1, 2004. Department teams have visited the site, spoken to the warden and managers, and personally inspected the facilities. Based upon these inspections, we have concluded that this facility best meets our criteria. Therefore, we were seeking an intergovernmental agreement with Brush County for the housing of female inmates in the Brush County Correctional Facility, operated by GRW Corporation, a reputable private company which specializes in correctional management.

On June 25, 2004, we were informed that Brush County requires additional time to ensure that it has the requisite statutory authority to enter into the intergovernmental agreement. Prior to this time, we had no basis to believe the county would not sign the intergovernmental agreement. We do not know when they will reach a final decision, and whether they will need additional statutory authority in order to execute the intergovernmental agreement.

Because we are unable to come to an agreement on this legal issue, negotiations have come to a standstill. However, GRW is willing to contract with us on exactly the same terms and conditions, including price and services, as would Brush County if they had the necessary statutory authority. Therefore, we are requesting an exemption from Chapter 103D, to allow us to enter into an Agreement with GRW. It would not be practical or advantageous to try to procure these services through competitive means at this time, because we know of no other housing that would better meet our criteria at this time, and the competitive process will, in all probability, have the same result.

2. In April 2004, the department sent a Letter of Intent to several vendors soliciting cost figures for the incarceration of 60-100 sentenced felon females. One of the mandatory conditions was that the contract would be entered into with a governmental entity. The department received responses from 7 organizations: Oklahoma Department of Corrections, Maranatha, CSC, LSC CS Inc., MTS Corp., Emerald Corp., and GRW.

A group of four people evaluated the proposals, and the top three organizations were selected. 1) Maranatha, 2) Emerald Corp. 3) GRW. These three organizations provided the most programs/services/requirements of the seven organizations. Arrangements were made for the site visit of Maranatha and Emerald Corp only, as staff from the department already visited GRW facility. Maranatha was later eliminated because California law did not allow the housing of out-of-state inmates in their state, except through the interstate compact agreement. Warden Ted Sakai visited Emerald Corp. facility and felt that it wasn't appropriate because they were very large, and housed both males and females jail inmates at the facility. GRW was then pursued.

Although Oklahoma DOC stated that they would try to provide many of the programs listed, PSD's experience over the last year demonstrated that Oklahoma's facility did not have the work opportunities or substance abuse and other programming demanded for Hawaii inmates. The lack of activities made the Oklahoma facility

unacceptable on a long-term basis. CSC did not provide a location and was very unspecific about their ability to provide services and the cost. LSC did not provide any information regarding the services or programs available. MTS was a male/female facility and quoted a higher price. GRW stated that they were able to provide 17 out the 19 requirements, was a small facility of 250 (an appropriate size for our population, making more program/work line slots available for our inmates), and was the sole female-only facility under final consideration.

3. The Department has explored all known possibilities for housing inmates in suitable out-of-state correctional facilities. All potential vendors have been evaluated to ensure that their facilities meet the minimum criteria. The Director of Public Safety has closely reviewed the various options, to ensure that the States receives quality service at a fair price, and has approved the Brush County Correctional Facility option.